

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
OXFORD DIVISION**

**SOUTH MISSISSIPPI ELECTRIC POWER
ASSOCIATION**

PLAINTIFF

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:14-CV-278-DMB-SAA

M & D COATINGS, INC.

DEFENDANT

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO COMPEL

On April 28, 2016 defendant filed a motion to compel plaintiff to produce documents withheld on claims of attorney client privilege or the work product doctrine for *in camera* review of the privilege claims. Docket 120. Alternatively, defendant requests an order requiring a more specific privilege log from plaintiff. *Id.* The court has reviewed the motion and holds that it should be denied.

LOCAL UNIFORM CIVIL RULE 7(b)(2)(C) requires a party to “file a discovery motion sufficiently in advance of the discovery deadline to allow response to the motion, ruling by the court and time to effectuate the court’s order before the discovery deadline.” Because defendant’s motion was not filed sufficiently in advance of the April 29, 2016 discovery deadline to allow response, ruling and effectuation of the court’s ruling on the motion before the deadline as required by L.U.Civ.R. 7(b)(2)(C), the court finds that the motion is not well taken, and it is DENIED.

SO ORDERED, this, the 29th day of April, 2016.

s/ S. Allan Alexander
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE